

[MR. SPEAKER in the Chair.]

MR. SPEAKER.—I have received a request which is a very legitimate one, that certain members wanted on record that they have opposed the Resolution and voted against it. The following seven members have opposed the Special Motion :

Sriyuths :—

1. B. R. Sunthankar
2. V. S. Patil
3. B. P. Kadam
4. N. O. Samaji
5. L. B. Birje
6. G. K. Manvi
7. Bapu Rao Hulsurkar.

I have accepted that it will go into the records.

SRI B. P. KADAM.—Sir, I was deeply hurt when the Hon'ble Chief Minister remarked about women of North Kanara and South Kanara. I respectfully submit that it may kindly be withdrawn.

MR. SPEAKER.—There was a very vague reference and not so specific. There are good people and bad people everywhere, all over the world, not only in this country or in this area or that area ; it is well known.

Now we pass on to the next item.

SUPPLEMENTARY AND ADDITIONAL DEMANDS FOR THE YEAR 1964-65.

Demand No. 11 :—Taxes on Income other than Corporation Tax.

SRI S. R. KANTHI.—Sir, on the recommendation of the Governor of Mysore and on behalf of the Hon'ble Minister for Finance, I beg to move :

“ That a further sum not exceeding Rs. 10,900 be granted to the Government to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the financial year for the period ending 31st day March 1965, in respect of “Taxes on Income other than Corporation Tax.”

MR. SPEAKER.—Motion moved :

“ That a further sum not exceeding Rs. 10,900 be granted to the Government to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the financial year for the period ending 31st Day of March 1965, in respect of “Taxes on Income other than Corporation Tax.”

(MR. SPEAKER)

The other Demands 2 to 27, 29, 30, 30A, 31 to 34, 36, 40, 41, 41A, 41 to 48, 50 to 54 inclusive are deemed to have been moved. The Debate will begin.

Now, we close the debate on these Demands to-day. So, let not the Members feel embarrassed later on.

Sri S. M. KRISHNA (Maddur).—We have have little less than 90 minutes.

Mr. SPEAKER.—We shall sit for half-an-hour more. All of us have contributed to this inroad.

Sri S. M. KRISHNA.—Sir, the Supplementary Demands placed before this House for this year 1964-65 contains 54 items. At the outset, Sir, I would question the wisdom of placing Supplementary Demands to a tune of such a large amount. The Supplementary Demands contain charges on very many new services also. The most important of these is the establishment of the Directorate of Vigilance of Mysore State. I whole-heartedly welcome the appointment of a Vigilance Directorate in keeping with the recommendations made by the Santanam Committee which would go into the question of corruption at all levels of Government. Even though I welcome the establishment of the Directorate of Vigilance, I must also give expression to my doubts about the purpose that this Vigilance Directorate would serve. More than once I have drawn the attention of the State Government to the various other recommendations made by the Santanam Committee. In principle, the Government of India have agreed to most of the recommendations made by the Santanam Committee. It is only on the basis of the recommendation of that committee, a uniform pattern of appointment of vigilance bodies in every State of the Union has been accepted and implemented. Recently, the Chief Minister gave expression to his feelings on corruption. He was pleased to observe that corruption has been there at all times. He also said that the volume might vary and the quantum might also vary but he was firm that there has not been any appreciable increase in corruption in the country. I hold a different opinion. If there is any single evil which has found existence in our society, it is corruption and it should be fought with all the sincerity and with all the devotion that the problem demands. But I question whether that sincerity and devotion has been employed by the various Governments in this country. All of us do talk about corruption and all of us are very sincere when we say that we should eradicate corruption. I do not know whether it is humanly possible to eradicate it but we might try to put down corruption whenever it is found and whenever it is proved. Very recently, I made a point that corruption should be tackled not only from the lowest level but on the other it must be tackled from the top. But my friends on the other side want this problem of corruption to be tackled at the grass roots but they would not climb up the pyramid of corruption in this country which is the greatest single disservice that the Ruling Party is doing in this country. One of the basic

recommendations of the Santanam Committee is this *viz.* whenever responsible allegations are made against an elected Ministry by not less than ten members of the Legislature, then a Commission of Enquiry ought to go into that question and a decision taken on that. Here we have a spectacle where 30 members of the State Legislature made allegations against a Ministry and a petition was presented to the President of the Republic and then in Delhi a Cabinet Sub-committee sits in judgment and clears the Chief Minister and other Ministers from all the charges. Recently, the Chief Minister also said that certain allegations were made against him and that they had been decided. Are we going to take this verdict of the Cabinet Sub-Committee without a pinch of salt?

Sri RAMAKRISHNA HEGDE (Minister for Development, Panchayet Raj and Co-operation).—How are these remarks relevant to the present Demands, Sir?

Sri S. M. KRISHNA.—The remarks that I am about to submit to this House will have a direct bearing on Demand No. 10 which goes to establish a Vigilance Directorate in this State. It is only in that connection that I would like to dilate on these charges. Are we going to take the decision of the Cabinet Sub-committee as a decision coming from persons who are impartial? Is an opportunity given to those who made these allegations to prove their allegations? A statement was made by the Prime Minister of this country only the other day in the Parliament where it was said that there was no basis for the charges of corruption against the Mysore Ministry even though there might have been irregularities in the affairs of the Sharavathi Valley Project. After Chief Minister replied to the allegations that were made against him and his other Cabinet Colleagues, we only thought that an opportunity would be given to us to rebut those arguments. But unfortunately that procedure was given a gobye and they came to certain conclusions. This will have to be looked into from the point of view of various other things that are happening in this country. If I may narrate the Orissa episode.....

Mr. SPEAKER.—The Hon'ble Member cannot go into it except as an incidental reference.

Sri S. M. KRISHNA.—Incidentally, reference to Orissa is connected with our own episode here.

Mr. SPEAKER.—The concept of connection may vary in different minds. If it is for the purpose of argument the Hon'ble Member wants to refer to it, the connection should be tangible. I won't allow the Hon'ble Member to get into the facts of Orissa incident.

Sri S. M. KRISHNA.—I am not going to drag in names.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Not only names but even matters that transpired in Orissa we are not going to dissect and analyse here.

Sri C. J. MUCKANNAPPA.—He is going to refer to the Orissa incident only just to substantiate his stand.

Mr. SPEAKER.—As I said, if the Hon'ble Member is going to get into the facts, I won't allow that.

Sri S. M. KRISHNA.—Sir, I am not going into the details but into the veracity of a decision handed down by the Cabinet Sub-Committee with reference to the Orissa episode because it is relevant to the Mysore episode.

Sri RAMAKRISHNA HEGDE.—How any matter connected with the Cabinet Sub-Committee is relevant to the Demands before the House, I cannot understand. If the Hon'ble Member wants to speak on the vigilance commissioner appointed by the Mysore Government, we can understand. We have no hand in it. We have nothing to do with the Central Vigilance Commissioner or any action taken by the Central Government.

Sri S. SIVAPPA.—These demands are placed before this House by the Ministry against which the chargesheet is there and the findings of the Sub-Committee are relevant because we are dealing with the demands placed by this Ministry.

Sri S. M. KRISHNA.—In the Orissa case the Union Home Minister made a statement followed by a statement by the Prime Minister where they said that there were minor irregularities and that certain persons should resign. What is revealed by the alleged C.B.I. Report which has been admitted by the Speaker of Lok Sabha and which has now become a public document.....

Mr. SPEAKER.—If the Member wants to make comparisons I do not know what to do. It is true that the discussion is on the Supplementary Demands and in fact the discussion on Supplementary demands is a miniature Debate on the Budget so far as the principles and policies of Government are concerned and I cannot shut out that. But certainly it does not mean that anything and everything could be brought into the discussion. Because the scope is wide it does not mean that some decision taken by the Central Government or the Sub-Committee of the Cabinet becomes a matter directly for consideration here. Hon'ble Members may casually refer to them but if they take any report and go on analysing it, what has that got to do with our discussion?

Sri S. M. KRISHNA.—After witnessing all that which happened in this country with reference to various other States and the way the Government of India and the Cabinet Sub-Committee took decisions on them, I humbly submit to this House and through this House to the country and the State at large.....

Mr. SPEAKER.—I am not going to allow this House to be made an agency to appeal to the public or to anybody else.

Sri K. LAKKAPPA (Hebbur).—We have elected the Members of Parliament

Sri S. M. KRISHNA.—Through you I make this submission to this House and that submission is, do we have any respect for rule of law in this State? Is the accused going to sit in judgment over an act or a crime that he has committed? Should there not be some other agency which should fix the responsibility?

Sri K. PUTTASWAMY (Minister for Municipal Administration).—This is the agency to determine all these things and this agency has determined it on the non-confidence motion.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Where is the accused here! I am not able to understand.

Sri S. M. KRISHNA.—I am only just drawing an analogy. Is the accused going to sit in judgement on his own act? I say he should not. But here we are governed by certain political ideology. There is the ruling party and there are Opposition groups and Opposition party. Now whenever allegations are made, as responsible legislators how are you going to decide? What was good for Punjab must be good for us also here.

Mr. SPEAKER.—We are directly responsible to the House. If any no-confidence motion is carried, every Minister will have to resign. I have not been able to follow the point that the Ministers are the accused that they themselves are sitting in judgment, etc. It was the Central Cabinet Sub-Committee which was sitting in judgment and it is not the House or the Cabinet that is sitting in judgement.

Sri K. LAKKAPPA.—They belong to the same party.

Sri S. M. KRISHNA.—We made certain allegations against the Ministers belonging to the Congress Party and their people up in Delhi are sitting in judgement over their own Ministers.

Sri K. PUTTASWAMY.—Why do you go to Delhi? This House has decided that there was no force in your allegations.

Sri S. M. KRISHNA.—At that rate even crimes can be decided by majority vote. We are not debating the censure motion here, but we are discussing the pros and cons of the Vigilance Commission and why Ministers were not brought within the jurisdiction of the Vigilance Commission. It is all right Government Servants will be hauled up before the Vigilance Commission. Then why not corrupt Ministers in the State also be hauled up before them?

Sri K. PUTTASWAMY.—This House can decide that on a motion of no-confidence and this House has decided.

Sri S. M. KRISHNA.—Item 4 of the Demand says :

“ A State Vigilance Commission on the model of the Central Vigilance Commission has been constituted by the State Government in G. O. No. dated 11th February 1965. This Commission is headed by a Vigilance Commissioner. Under him there will be (i) a Bureau of Investigation headed by a Deputy Inspector-General of Police and (2) Directorate of Vigilance headed by a Senior I. A. S. Officer.”

There is also the Anti-Corruption Department and I do not know if a Deputy Inspector-General of Police is attached to the Anti-Corruption Department, but I am sure that Deputy Superintendent of Police is attached to the Anti-Corruption Department.

(SRI S. M. KRISHNA)

5-00 P.M.

Now the Anti-Corruption Department has been functioning in our State for quite a number of years. Now, because the Directorate of Vigilance has come in this State, what are the specific functions of the Directorate of Vigilance; (2) legislators— I am not prepared to swallow the idea that legislators cannot become corrupt. If a legislator becomes corrupt or if a responsible minister becomes corrupt, how are we to deal with such questions? These questions have to be faced today. Now, I am perfectly certain that the Vigilance Commission will not have any jurisdiction over ministers, legislators and over non-official bodies and non-official members. Now, charges of corruption have been levelled against many ministers, many legislators and many other persons who have been presiding over certain bodies like the Khadi and Village Industries Board, many Chairmen and Secretaries of Co-operative institutions in the State. When we are making an attempt to tackle corruption the attempt must be a bold attempt, a courageous attempt and it must go to the roots of the question. A half-hearted attempt to fight corruption would certainly lead nobody nowhere and that is exactly the point that I was trying to make out. That is the reason why the Santanam Committee recommended that whenever allegations are made by more than 10 members cognisance must be taken about the allegation and then judicial enquiry under the Act of Enquiries ought to be held by a judicial authority. Then only it will be binding on the country, on the people and then only it can be said that the allegations have been given a fair trial. Till then, let me repeat what we have repeated any number of times before that we are not prepared to stomach the clearance—alleged clearance given by any authority in this country as long as judicial mind does not go into this question.

The State Vigilance Commission is formulated, on the model of the Central Vigilance Commission. We started talking about vigilance in the beginning of 1964; at one time the Chief Minister replied in this House that it has been very difficult to find a proper person to hold the office of the Directorate in the State and so he has been going out of State to find somebody. That is a sad commentary on the Chief Minister, if we come to the conclusion that we have not been able to find a right man for the job and it took more than a year to name a person to that post. Having named a person to that post, have you given him office; have you given him all the necessary state and establishment to investigate cases? I am afraid not. Whenever we make an effort it must be sincere; it must be implemented also with the same sincerity. That is my humble suggestion. When the reply comes on behalf of the Government, I would very much like them to say what becomes the fate of the Anti-Corruption Department in the State. Where does the function of the Commissioner of Anti-Corruption start and where does the function of the Vigilance Commission start? This has to be decided; After all,

all of us know as lawyers that there is what is known as law of double jeopardy. No Government servant can be put to double jeopardy. What happens if for the same allegation the Anti-Corruption Department starts investigation and the Vigilance Commission investigation and they come to different conclusions? Of course it is a hypothetical proposition. Have you given enough thoughts to this idea? If so, don't you think that you are organising the Vigilance Directorate on solid foundations? Now, the impression is that you have not given thoughts to a problem like this would deserve. Santanam Committee made certain recommendations and in a hurry these recommendations were accepted. Recently I might quote that the Union Home Minister declared on the floor of the Lok Sabha that in principle they have agreed to Santanam Committee recommendations. I know more than one State in the Indian Union have accepted the recommendations of the Santanam Committee. The other day when we were debating the enesure motion, when asked what was the attitude of the State Government to the Santanam Committee report, no answer was forthcoming. Why is this Government shirking to accept the recommendations of the Santanam Committee? Whatever you accept to day they will be there for all time. Tomorrow, if God willing, we happen to sit there, it will be binding on us also. So, it is in this light I would like you to consider the recommendations of the Santanam Committee and come to clear conclusions about these recommendations. It is in the larger interest of clean administration, it is in the larger interest of this country as a whole, that we have to accept these recommendations. Otherwise these allegations and counts allegations will come neverending; you are not going to submit to judicial enquiry and we are going to say that we are going to repeat the same allegations. Where are we leading this country to? I want the hon'ble Minister, Municipal Administration to ponder over this? Where are you leading us?

Sri K. PUTTASWAMY.—That will lead to 1967 elections.

Sri S. M. KRISHNA.—The other day the Chief Minister said that 1967 election will take care of itself. It will take care of us. We make no reservations about it we are perfectly safe in that 1967 will take care of itself.

Mr. SPEAKER.—The agenda for tomorrow has been issued on the supposition that this will be over today. The hon'ble member has taken 45 minutes.

Sri C. J. MUCKANNAPPA.—There are many other items included here as new services.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Then I will have to cut short the time allotted for other Demands.

Sri S. M. KRISHNA.—The Government notification deals with the functions of the Vigilance Director. If we are not willing to submit ourselves to certain recommendations of the Santhanam Committee, I would suggest that at least these Ministers could be brought under the purview of the Public Servant right now. Ministers do not come under

(SRI S. M. KRISHNA)

the purview of the Public Servant. If Ministers in definition are made to come under the purview of the public servant, then they would be within the jurisdiction of the Vigilance Commissioner and to that extent at least we can make allegations to the Vigilance Commissioner.

SRI D. DEVARAJ URS (Minister for Labour, Housing and Transport).—What about the Vigilance Commissioner? The Hon'ble Member wants the Ministers to be on par with the Public Servants. The basis for this perhaps is they are drawing salary and allowances like any other Government servant. This may be one of the reasons. Even Legislators come under this purview according to him.

MR. SPEAKER.—The Hon'ble Minister just wants to know whether he is proposing to include even Legislators.

SRI C. J. MUCKANNAPPA.—Including the Speaker and the Deputy Speaker, Sir.

MR. SPEAKER.—I am not in any management of anything. Speaker is not conducting any business which amounts to corruption.

MR. S. M. KRISHNA.—The Hon'ble Minister Devaraj Urs has raised this point and I have made it very clear at the outset that it must be all pervading of non-officials including the Chairman of the Kadhi and Village Industries Board. There is an unseemly controversy about the affairs of the Khadi and Village Industries Board. So we have to find answer to this Controversy. It must be set at rest at some point. If you accept the recommendations of the Santhanam Committee then it is not necessary that we must get at the frank definition of Public Servant. Even the tenure of an Hon'ble Member is limited in this sense that as long as he behaves well till the age of his retirement is five years confining himself to integrity. Otherwise this House can dismember him.

Sir, the double standard—i.e., trying to have one set of standard to these people who work under my thumb and altogether a different standard for myself, does not fit in to our sense of social justice. The Hon'ble Minister for Municipal Administration said that 1967 will take care of us. We have not developed the most perfect parliamentary democracy. The very fact is there that after 17 years of independence, we have not been able to evolve an Organisation effective opposition to the Congress. In fact we have to face this in this House. The opinion of the minority will have to be given due regard. It is a sin of this country. I am not going to apportion that sin to you.

SRI K. PUTTASWAMY.—That equally applies to him.

SRI S. M. KRISHNA.—We have not formulated a perfect democratic set up in this country. There is majority in almost every State except in Kerala. When you are safe, you have been safe so long as that majority continues. When you are in a firm position, I would appeal to the Congress Party to establish certain healthy conventions. Let us not forget it. Sri Jayaprakash Narayan said, in these days when you are strong you should also create a good opposition in this country. We do not want to have the creation of Opposition. But we want the

assurance from the authorities that they would do everything within their power to safeguard the interest of the Opposition and then to give them what is legitimately due to them. After all we represent to-day an electorate which is predominantly illiterate. I am not prepared to say that we represent a highly enlightened electorate in this country. No, we are not. They do not know what is politics to-day. Most of us will not be here if they know it. I would tell the Mysore Government that they should take a bigger view of this. It is only you have taken a short view of these things. You are confined to hold elections. They are very comfortable to you. I would suggest you to get away from this idea think of democratic set up and do it as it was 25 years ago. It is in this light, Sir, without taking back a single sentence that we have said so far about various allegations and various charges, I humbly submit that the Government has to take a clear stand on the recommendations of the Santhanam Committee.

Sri G. V. GOWDA.—Mr. Speaker, Sir, We can expect a regular Demand to be moved in the House, but not a Supplementary Demand. It has become almost a regular feature for us to receive these Supplementary Demands, not only in one or two instalments, but in third instalment also. It only shows that they are active. If it is to meet the extra grant, then it could be welcomed. But, most of these works are works which could have been contemplated even at the time when 1964-65 financial estimates were made. Further, by these methods, it will not be possible for any one to assess correctly the financial status or position of a State year to year, because it raises so much of confusion. How much money we are spending by way of Supplementary Demands and what is the corresponding yield, we do not know. It is absolutely impossible to make an assessment as to how much income we could derive by spending these monies or by spending all the money drawn from the Contingency Fund for reappropriation, which this Demand has asked for. However, I would like to make a few observations in respect of very few Demands.

The Demand at page 10 is in respect of several interest charges. No doubt it is a charged item. However, I wish to make an observation that the Government has not taken serious steps to convince the Planning Commission or any appropriate authority for having all these debts, which have been started from very many years, to have them consolidated to one single debt and to have a uniform rate of interest. You have been giving different rates of interest on different loans. We have also been suggesting that unless these things are simplified it will be very difficult on the finances of the State to meet these interest charges on loans that have been borrowed prior to Reorganisation. These are the recent loans borrowed for the purpose of investment on Projects; these are loans borrowed even prior to Reorganisation. Therefore, there is need for uniform rate of interest. So far as Rs. 25 lakhs for the interest to be paid towards the over-draft that the Government has taken by pledging securities available at the credit

(SRI G. V. GOWDA)

of the Consolidated Fund is concerned, we have got to consider whether this Legislature has put any limitation to the extent to which this Government could borrow. One of the provisions of the Constitution says that the State Legislature has to fix up some limitation to the extent to which the Government could borrow pledging its securities. I have not come across the Government seeking the approval to raise the upper limit of which the Government could borrow. It is not known whether there is any limit fixed. We do not know what provision was made in the regular Budget and how much money has been paid by way of interest charges.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Budget has already been passed.

SRI G. V. GOWDA.—I do not know how much grants have been provided—rather, I do not remember: over and above Rs. 25 lakhs has been asked. So, it speaks of the magnitude of the amount that the Government has borrowed during this financial year. Therefore, I want to make sure whether there is any limit at all and whether there is any occasion for the Government to have exceeded the limit. I expect a reply for this from the Honble Minister. This does not speak well, because for the formulation of the Third Plan though this Government envisaged to utilise 15 crores of rupees, from the reserve they have utilised 32 crores of rupees. If that were to be so, they should have borrowed more than what their securities could afford to get, and we do not know what percentage of interest they are paying towards this over-draft. It is not 3 or 4 or 5 per cent; it must be more than 8 to 9 per cent, and it cannot be calculated at all as to how much we are paying by way of interest alone. It may be more than Rs. 50 lakhs. If we pay so much of interest for this money, it will not bring real good to the people or to the State Exchequer.

In respect of the Mysore Secretariat Canteen, little said is the better. We were getting good food and estates prior to the Mysore Secretariat Canteen came into existence.

Demand No. 12 is with regard to the money that has to be paid for the water supply made to the Central Jail, Bangalore. In 1947, it appears there were two thousand convicts undergoing imprisonment and they took 2,000 as average persons who consumed water and on that basis money used to be claimed. Subsequent to 1949, the strength of the convicts in the Jail reduced to 200. But, Government took no action to write to the authorities that the strength of the convicts had come down and that the average should be calculated on a strength of 200. The water supply Department went on claiming arrears at the average of 2,000, the correspondence went on from 1950 to 1962, and ultimately they had to pay nearly Rs. 1,05,000 towards arrears on the basis of the average of 2,000 persons consumption. This is really very bad and it only shows what foresight these people have. The only possible inference that could be drawn is by this Demand No. 12, where

the Government have failed to secure a correct estimate that there are only 200 or 300 convicts in the Jail, the water consumed and the charges that had to be paid.

Under Demand No. 17, it is stated that they want to strengthen Science laboratories in certain High Schools and equip certain Secondary schools with Libraries. It is said that it is proposed to strengthen the High School Libraries in the State by giving them equipment grant at the rate of Rs. 800 per School for 160 schools during the current year. We do not know to which schools this gift is being made. I see a kind of discrimination in this. If it is for Government schools, I welcome it. This is a case of discriminating certain schools as against others, which will really have a very serious repercussion on the very administration. There must be some basis. If it is confined to rural population, we welcome it.

Mr. SPEAKER.—It is a Centrally sponsored scheme.

Sri G. V. GOWDA.—I welcome the Centrally sponsored scheme. But to which schools they are going to give this? We welcome this gift. We want our high schools to be equipped with library and equipment. There must be certain basis on which these things have got to be distributed. Let them give to rural high schools with a population of not less than 10,000; let them equip their own Government high schools.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Does the members accept the Demand?

5-30 P.M.

Sri G. V. GOWDA.—I accept the Demand. I should say that justice has got to be done. Without bias the Government has to take a rational view in making these allotments. Then coming to Anathalyas, I say there is no supervision. Some certificate will be obtained from the Tahsildar to see that the income from the parent is Rs. 500 or Rs. 600 and that child is admitted there. Nobody knows whether that child is being brought up in that particular Anathalaya but yet the Demand is made.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Which demand is that?

Sri G. V. GOWDA.—In fact it is the business of the Social Welfare Department to take care of these Anathas, women and children and there cannot be any duplicity of work.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Is there anything in the Supplementary Demands for Anathalayas?

Sri G. V. GOWDA.—I will make that observation under 'Education' Demand. In respect of Science teachers being sent for training, I should say, even this is not being done rationally. If the officers who are competent to take decisions are allowed to take decisions, I think most decisions would be just. So far as rural Housing scheme is concerned, I think the Government of India have provided some money at the end of the year.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Thank the Hon'ble Minister who went and fought for it.

Sri G. V. GOWDA.—We pay compliment to him. But here, I want to know how many agriculturists are advanced these loans for constructing Houses? The officers concerned go there and say something and nothing will follow. I do not know what amount under that is spent. Then with regard to managerial subsidy for Consumers' Co-operatives, there is a demand for Rs. 10,000. All these days, Mysore State went without such a Consumer Co-operative Society. Now this has been newly created in the course of this year. Whether it was inevitable is the question. As you know we are spending so much for getting food and we are subsidising it in many respects. Such being the case, we want to spend Rs. 50,000 towards managerial cost of the Consumer Co-operative Society that has been started recently. Was it inevitable to have a society started like that? If that is so, even the Food Corporation of India could have thought fit to finance the co-operative society at the State level instead of the Government taking up the responsibility of spending so much amount in this behalf. Then Yuvak Mandals and Mahila Mandals. They are receiving Rs. 28,500 this year. I do not know how many Yuvak Mandals were started and what kind of useful work was turned out by them. Then under Demand 24, a crore and 85 lakhs and odd has to be adjusted towards interest in respect of unproductive works. We have got to consider whether it is desirable that we should adopt such a method of making payments of interest in respect of works which are not remunerative. Sir, this is a thing that should have been taken into consideration. They should have considered how the neighbouring States are doing in respect of these works. At the fag end of the year you are spending one crore and 85 lakhs of rupees for this purpose. Then Demand No. 10 about Vigilance Commissioner; you are aware that the administration of a country or a State has three wings, legislative, executive and judiciary. So far as the staff that are working under the executive and the administration is concerned, they are being dealt with by the Vigilance Commissioner or the Anti-Corruption Department; even the staff working in the judiciary is also amenable to his jurisdiction. I do not know why we should not bring all of them under his purview. In fact Section 21 of the Indian Penal Code covers public servants.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Section 21 of the Indian Penal Code covers everybody.

Sri G. V. GOWDA.—We are not public servants. There must be something to regulate the conduct of the Members of the Legislature including Ministers. Even the Vigilance body should be able to book them and bring them under punishment. It is a reformation work. Therefore, Sir, that shows there is great need for the Members of the Legislature also to be brought under the purview of some sort of a body like this especially when we have taken so many steps to deal with the officers of the Government and the judiciary. With these observations,

೨ ಶ್ರೀ ಸಿದ್ಧಯ್ಯ ಕಾಶೀಮಠ.—ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರೇ, ಹೀಗೆ ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರು ಈ ಹೆಚ್ಚುವರಿ ಬೇಡಿಕೆಗಳನ್ನು ಮೇಲಿಂದ ಮೇಲೆ ಈ ಸಭೆಯ ಮುಂದೆ ಇಡತಕ್ಕದ್ದನ್ನು ನೋಡಿದರೆ—ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರಿಗೆ ಸರಿಯಾಗಿ ಬಡ್ಡಿಟ್ಟನ್ನು ತಯಾರಿಸಲು ಬರುವುದಿಲ್ಲವೋ ಏನೋ ಗೊತ್ತಾಗಲಿಲ್ಲ. ಹಾಗೆ ಗೊತ್ತಿದ್ದ ಪಕ್ಷದಲ್ಲಿ ಇದನ್ನೆಲ್ಲಾ ರೆಗ್ಯುಲರ್ ಬಡ್ಡಿಟ್ಟನ್ನಲ್ಲೇ ಸೇರಿಸಬಹುದಾಗಿತ್ತು. ಮೊದಲನೇ ಸಾರ್ತಿಗೆ 20 ಕೋಟಿ ರೂಪಾಯಿಗಳನ್ನೂ, ಇನ್ನು ಎರಡನೇ ಸಾರ್ತಿಗೆ 20 ಕೋಟಿ ರೂಪಾಯಿಗಳನ್ನೂ ಈಗ 20 ಕೋಟಿ 65 ಲಕ್ಷ ರೂಪಾಯಿಗಳನ್ನು ಕೇಳಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಈ ರೀತಿ ಮಾಡುತ್ತಿರುವುದು ನನಗೇನೂ ಸಮಂಜಸವಾಗಿ ಕಾಣುವುದಿಲ್ಲ ಹೀಗೆ ಸ್ವಿಮೆಂಟರಿ ರೂಪದಲ್ಲಿ ತರಕ್ಕದ್ದನ್ನು ರೆಗ್ಯುಲರ್ ಬಡ್ಡಿಟ್ಟನ್ನೇ ತರಬಹುದಾಗಿತ್ತು. ಆದರೆ ನಾನೀಗ ಇಲ್ಲಿ ಕಾಣಿಸಿರತಕ್ಕ ಒಂದೆರಡು ದಿವ್ಯಾಂಡುಗಳ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಸವಿಸ್ತಾರವಾಗಿ ವಿಚಾರ ಮಾಡಬೇಕೆಂದಿದ್ದೇನೆ. ಇಲ್ಲಿ ಕಾಣಿಸಿರತಕ್ಕ 10ನೇ ದಿವ್ಯಾಂಡಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಕ್ಯಾಂಟಿನನ್ನು ನಡೆಸುವುದಕ್ಕಾಗಿ ಒಬ್ಬ ಅಸಿಸ್ಟೆಂಟ್ ಕಮಿಷನರನ್ನು ನೇಮಕ ಮಾಡಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಆದರೆ ಈ ಕ್ಯಾಂಟಿನನ್ನು ಪ್ರಾರಂಭ ಮಾಡತಕ್ಕ ವಿಚಾರದಲ್ಲಿ ಈ ಸಭೆಯ ಅನುಮತಿಯನ್ನು ಪಡೆಯದೆ ಮಾಡಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಇದಕ್ಕೆ ಈಗ 4 ಲಕ್ಷ ರೂಪಾಯಿಗಳನ್ನು ಖರ್ಚುಮಾಡಬೇಕಾದ ಬಂದಿದೆ. ಆದರೆ ಇದರಲ್ಲಿ ಅಂಥ ಚೆಲೋ ತಿಂಡಿಗಳನ್ನೇನೂ ಮಾಡುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಹಾಗೆ ರುಚಿಕರವಾದ ತಿಂಡಿ ಸಾಮಾನುಗಳನ್ನು ಮಾಡುವುದಿಲ್ಲ ದರಗಳನ್ನು ಮಾತ್ರ ದುಬಾರಿಯಾಗಿವೆ. ಹೀಗೆ ಒಳ್ಳೆ ಟೆಟಿನನ್ನೂ ಮಾಡದೆ ಹೆಚ್ಚಿನ ದರಗಳನ್ನು ಹಾಕಿ ನಡೆಸತಕ್ಕ ಒಂದು ಕ್ಯಾಂಟಿನಿನ ಕೇವಲ ಶಿಬ್ಬಂದಿ ವೆಚ್ಚಕ್ಕಾಗಿ ನಾವು 5 ಲಕ್ಷ ರೂಪಾಯಿಗಳನ್ನು ಖರ್ಚುಮಾಡಬೇಕಾಗಿದೆ. ಅಷ್ಟೇ ಅಲ್ಲ, ಆದರ ಯುಟೆನ್ಸಿರ್ಸ್‌ನ್ನು ಕೊಂಡುಕೊಳ್ಳುವುದಕ್ಕೂ ಸರ್ಕಾರವೇ ಒಂದು ಲಕ್ಷ ರೂಪಾಯಿಗಳನ್ನು ಕೊಡಬೇಕಂತೆ. ಈ ದಿವನ ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರು ರೋಡ್ ಟ್ರಾನ್ಸ್‌ಪೋರ್ಟ್ ಬಾಬನ್ನು ರಾಷ್ಟ್ರೀಕರಣ ಮಾಡಿರುವಂತೆ ಈ ಹೋಟಲುಗಳನ್ನೂ ರಾಷ್ಟ್ರೀಕರಣ ಮಾಡಲಿ, ಹೆಚ್ಚು ರಾಭ ಪಡೆಯತಕ್ಕ ಅವಕಾಶವಿದ್ದರೆ ಮಾಡಬಹುದು. ಇವತ್ತಿನ ದಿವನ ಇದಕ್ಕೆ ಸಿಬ್ಬಂದಿ ಖರ್ಚು ಮತ್ತು ಇತರ ಖರ್ಚು ಹೆಚ್ಚಾಗುತ್ತಾ ಇದೆಯೇ ಹೊರತು ಹಿಂದಿನ ರೀತಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಆದಾಯ ಬರತಕ್ಕ ಹೋಟೆಲ್ ಆಗಿಲ್ಲ. ಆದ್ದರಿಂದ ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರು ಇದನ್ನು ಮುಚ್ಚಬೇಕೆಂದು ಈ ಸಮಯದಲ್ಲಿ ಹೇಳುತ್ತೇನೆ; ಮತ್ತು ಇದನ್ನು ಬೇರೆಯರಿಗಾಗಿ ಆಕ್ಷನ್ ರೀತಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಕೊಟ್ಟು ಅದರಿಂದ ಉತ್ಪನ್ನ ಬರುವಂತೆ ಮಾಡಬೇಕೆಂದು ಸಲಹೆ ಮಾಡುತ್ತೇನೆ.

“ Mysore Language Commission—To make arrangements for the translation of Acts and Rules and other things.”

ಡಿವ್ಯಾಂಡ್ ನಂಬರ್ 18ರಲ್ಲಿ ಮೆಡಿಕಲ್ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಕೆಲವು ಹಣವನ್ನು ಕೇಳುತ್ತಾ ಇದ್ದೀರಿ. ಧಾರವಾಡ ಜಿಲ್ಲೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ರೆಪ್ರೆಸೆಂಟೇಷನ್ ಸಂಖ್ಯೆ ಹೆಚ್ಚಾಗುತ್ತಾ ಇದೆ; ಅಲ್ಲರತಕ್ಕೆ ರೆಪ್ರೆಸೆಂಟೇಷನ್‌ಯನ್ನೂ ಸರ್ಕಾರದಷ್ಟು ಬಡ್ತಿ ಇಲ್ಲದೇ ಅಲ್ಲಿಗೆ ಬರತಕ್ಕ ರೋಗಿಗಳು ತಿರುಗಿ ವಾಪಸು ಕೊಡಲಾಗತಕ್ಕ ಪ್ರತಿಷ್ಠಿತ ಉಂಟಾಗಿದೆ. ಇದು ಒಂದು ಮಾಹಾ ರೋಗ ಇರುವುದರಿಂದ, ಅಂಟು ರೋಗ ಇರುವುದರಿಂದ ಆದಷ್ಟು ಹೆಚ್ಚು ಸಂಖ್ಯೆಯ ಬಡ್ತಿಯನ್ನು ಪ್ರೋತ್ಸೇಹ ಮಾಡಬೇಕೆಂದು ಈ ಸಮಯದಲ್ಲಿ ಹೇಳುತ್ತೇನೆ.

ಇನ್ನು ಡಿಮ್ಯಾಂಡ್ ನಂಬರ್ 23ರ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಒಂದು ಮಾತು. ಹಳೆಯಲ್ಲರತಕ್ಕ ಕನಸ್ಸೊಮ್ಮರ ಸೊಪ್ಪುಗಳಿಗೆ ನಷ್ಟ ಕೊಡುತ್ತಾ ಇಲ್ಲ, ಎರಡು ವರ್ಷಗಳಿಂದ ನಿಲ್ಲಿಸಲಾಗಿದೆ. ಈಗರಾದರೂ ಕೂಡ ಅವುಗಳ ಏಳಿಗೆಗೆ ನಷ್ಟ ಕೊಡದಿದ್ದರೆ ಅವುಗಳನ್ನು ಮುಚ್ಚುವ ಪ್ರಸಂಗ ಬರುತ್ತದೆ. ಅದರಿಂದ ಅದಕ್ಕೆ ಗಮನ ಕೊಡಬೇಕೆಂದು ಹೇಳುತ್ತೇನೆ.

(ಶ್ರೀ ಸಿದ್ದಯ್ಯಕಾಶೀಮಠ)

ಡಿಮ್ಯಾಂಡ್ ನಂಬರ್ 34ರಲ್ಲಿ ಪೆನ್‌ಷನ್ ವಿಷಯ ಇದೆ. ರಿಟೈರ್ ಆದಂತಹ ಟೀಚರ್‌ಗೆ 9 ತಿಂಗಳಿನಿಂದ ಪೆನ್‌ಷನ್ ಸಿಕ್ಕಿಲ್ಲ. ಒಂದು ಉದಾಹರಣೆ ಕೆಳಬೇಕೆಂದರೆ, ಧಾರವಾಡದ ಡಿಸ್ಟ್ರಿಕ್ಟ್ ಸ್ಕೂಲ್ ಬೋರ್ಡ್ ಹೆಚ್ ಸ್ಕೂಲಿನಿಂದ ಒಟ್ಟು ಟೀಚರ್ 9 ತಿಂಗಳ ಕೆಳಗೆ ರಿಟೈರ್ ಆದರು. ಇವತ್ತಿನ ವರಗೂ ಸಹ ಅವರಿಗೆ ಪೆನ್‌ಷನ್ ಸಿಕ್ಕಿಲ್ಲ. ಆದ್ದರಿಂದ ರಿಟೈರ್ ಆದ ಎರಡು ತಿಂಗಳೊಳಗೆ ಪೆನ್‌ಷನ್ ಸಿಕ್ಕುವಂತಹ ವ್ಯವಸ್ಥೆ ಮಾಡಬೇಕೆಂದು ಹೇಳುತ್ತೇನೆ.

ಕೊನೆಯದಾಗಿ ಹೇಳುವುದೇನೆಂದರೆ, ಸರ್ಕಾರಿ ನೌಕರರಿಗೆ ಡಿ.ಎ., ಎಚ್.ಆರ್.ಎ. ಇವುಗಳ ನೈರಾಲ್ ಕೊಟ್ಟಿದ್ದೀರಿ ಇದನ್ನೆಲ್ಲಾ ಒಪ್ಪುತ್ತೇನೆ. ಈಗ ತಾನೆ ಮದ್ರಾಸ್ ರೇಟ್ ಪ್ರಕಾರ ಡಿ.ಎ. ಕೊಡುತ್ತೇವೆ ಎಂದು ಹೇಳಿದರು. ಇದರಲ್ಲಿ 4ನೇ ದರ್ಜೆಯ ನೌಕರರಿಗೆ ಹೆಚ್ಚು ಸಾಲತ್ತು ಸಿಕ್ಕದೆ ಇರುವುದರಿಂದ ಅವರು ಕುಯ್ಯಗುಟ್ಟತಕ್ಕ ಪರಿಸ್ಥಿತಿ ಬಂದಿದೆ, ಆದಕ್ಕೇ ಒಂದು ಪೇ ಕಮಿಷನ್ನನ್ನು ವೇಮಿಸಿ ಅವರ ತಕರಾರನ್ನು ಬಿಡಿಸಬೇಕೆಂದು ಹೇಳುತ್ತೇನೆ.

† ಶ್ರೀ ಸಿ. ಜೆ. ಮುಕ್ಕಣ್ಣಪ್ಪ.—ಸ್ವಾಮಿ, ಈ ಸಪ್ಲಿಮೆಂಟರಿ ಡಿಮ್ಯಾಂಡ್‌ನಲ್ಲಿ ನಮ್ಮ ಸ್ನೇಹಿತರು ಶ್ರೀಮಾನ್ ವೆಂಕಟೇಗೌಡರು ಹೇಳಿದ ಹಾಗೆ ಹೊಸದು ಏನಾದರೂ ಒಂದು ನೀತಿ ನಿಯಮ ಇದೆಯೇ? ಈ ಬೇಡಿಕೆಗಳನ್ನು ಸಚಿವರು ಕೇಳುವುದು ಯಾವಾಗ ಏನು ಅಂತ ಕೇಳಿ ಅದಕ್ಕೆ ಒಂದು ಸ್ವಲ್ಪ ಮುಂದಾರೋಚನೆ ಇರಬೇಕೆಂದು ನಾನಾದರೂ ಅಂದುಕೊಂಡಿದ್ದೇನೆ. 1957 ರಿಂದ ಇವತ್ತಿನ ವರಗೂ ಎಷ್ಟು ಸಾರಿ ಈ ಸಭೆಯ ಮುಂದೆ ಸಪ್ಲಿಮೆಂಟರಿ ಗ್ರಾಂಟುಗಳನ್ನು ಕೇಳಿದ್ದೀರಿ ಎಂದು ರೆಕ್ಕಾ ಹಾಕಿದೆ. ಶ್ರೀಮಾನ್ ಜತ್ತಿಯವರು ಹಣಕಾಸಿನ ಸಚಿವರಾದ ಮೇಲೆ ಇದು ಬಹು ಸಂಖ್ಯೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಬೇಡಿದೆ. ಈ ಹಣ ಹೇಗೆ ಖರ್ಚಾಗುತ್ತದೆ, ಬಡ್ಡಿಯನ್ನು ಹೇಗೆ ಮಾಡಬೇಕು, ಯಾವ ಯಾವ ಖಾತೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಹೇಗೆ ಹಣ ಖರ್ಚಾಗುತ್ತದೆ ಎಂಬುದನ್ನು ರೆಕ್ಕಾ ಹಾಕಿದರೆ ಹಿಂದೆ ಶ್ರೀಮಾನ್ ಮರಿಯಪ್ಪನವರು ಹಣಕಾಸಿನ ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳಾಗಿದ್ದಾಗ ಒಂದು ವರ್ಷಕ್ಕೆ ಒಂದು ಸಪ್ಲಿಮೆಂಟರಿ ಗ್ರಾಂಟನ್ನು ಮಾತ್ರ ಕೇಳುತ್ತಾ ಇದ್ದರು ಅದೂ ಬಹಳವಾಗಿ ಹಿಡಿದು, ಈ ಸಭೆ ಏನು ಅನ್ನುತ್ತದೆಯೋ, ಅಕೌಂಟೆಟ್ ಜನರಲ್ ಅವರು ಏನು ಅನ್ನುತ್ತಾರೆಯೋ ಅಂತ ಅಂದುಕೊಂಡು ಕೇಳುತ್ತಾ ಇದ್ದರು. ಈಗ ಏನಾಗಿದೆ ಎಂದರೆ ಗ್ರಾಮ ಪಂಚಾಯ್ತಿ, ತಾಲ್ಲೂಕು ಬೋರ್ಡು ಬಡ್ಡೆಟ್ ಯಾವ ರೀತಿ ಮಾಡುತ್ತದೆಯೋ ಆ ರೀತಿ ಮಾಡಿಕೊಂಡು ಯಾವಾಗ ಬೇಕಾದರೂ ಹಣ ಕೇಳಬಹುದು ಎಂದು ಹೇಗೆ ಅವರು ಮಾಡುತ್ತಾರೆಯೋ ಹಾಗೆ ಸಂಸ್ಥಾನದ ಬಡ್ಡೆಟ್ ಆಗಿದೆ. ಹಣಕಾಸಿನ ವಿಷಯದಲ್ಲಿ ಮೈಸೂರು ಸರ್ಕಾರ ಆಗಲ ಅಥವಾ ಹಣಕಾಸಿನ ಸಚಿವರಾಗಲ ಇದಕ್ಕೆ ಅಷ್ಟು ಮನಸ್ಸು ಕೊಟ್ಟಿರಲಿಲ್ಲ. ರಿಸರ್ವ್ ಬ್ಯಾಂಕಿನಿಂದ ಕೊಟ್ಟಾಂತರ ರೂಪಾಯಿಗಳನ್ನು ಸಾಲ ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಂಡಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಒವರ್ ಡ್ರಾಫ್ಟ್ ಮೂಲಕ ಹಣ ಪಡೆದು ಖರ್ಚುಮಾಡಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಅಂತಹ ಕಠಿಣವಾದ ಪ್ರಸಂಗದಲ್ಲಿ ಖರ್ಚು ಮಾಡತಕ್ಕ ಹಣವನ್ನು ಬುದ್ಧಿವಂತಿಕೆಯಿಂದ ಮಾಡಿದ್ದಾರೆಯೇ ಎಂದರೆ, ಇಲ್ಲ. ಯಾರಾದರೂ ಬಡ ನೌಕರನಿಗೆ, ಒಂದು ಒಳ್ಳೆಯ ಕೆಲಸಕ್ಕೆ ಒಂದು ರೂಪಾಯಿ ಕೇಳಿದರೆ ಮಾನ್ಯ ಹಣಕಾಸಿನ ಸಚಿವರಿಗೆ ಇಲ್ಲದೇ ಇರತಕ್ಕ ಸಂಕಟ, ಇಲ್ಲದೇ ಇರತಕ್ಕ ವ್ಯಥೆ ಬರುತ್ತದೆ.

Mr. SPEAKER.—I am not concerned with the health of the Hon'ble Minister for Finance. I am concerned with the Budget.

ಶ್ರೀ ಸಿ. ಜೆ. ಮುಕ್ಕಣ್ಣಪ್ಪ.—ಹಣಕಾಸು ಕೊಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಅಷ್ಟೆ.

ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರು.— ಸಂಕಟ ಎಂದರೆ ಏನು ?

ಶ್ರೀ ಸಿ. ಜೆ. ಮುಕ್ಕಣ್ಣಪ್ಪ.— ಸಂಕಟಕ್ಕೂ ಅವರ ಹೆಸ್ರಿಗೂ ಏನೂ ಸಂಬಂಧ ಇಲ್ಲ. ಅವರಿಗೆ ಕೊಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಸ್ವಲ್ಪ ಮನಸ್ಸು ಬಗಿ ಹಿಡಿಯುತ್ತಾರೆ, ಜಿಗಟು ಮಾಡುತ್ತಾರೆ. ಬಡವನಿಗೆ ಒಳ್ಳೆಯ ಕೆಲಸಕ್ಕೆ ಒಂದು ರೂಪಾಯಿ ಕೊಡಿ ಎಂದರೆ ಕೊಡುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಕೆಲವು ಖಾತೆಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಚರಂಡಿಗೆ ಹಣವನ್ನು ಸುರಿಯುತ್ತಾ ಇರುವುದನ್ನು ತಡೆಯುವುದಿಲ್ಲ ಎಂಬುದನ್ನು ಹೇಳುತ್ತಾ ಇದ್ದೇನೆ. ಅವರಿಗೆ ಇರತಕ್ಕ ಸಂಕಟ, ಅವರ ಮನಸ್ಸಿನ ಇಡ್ಡೆ ಏನೇನು ಇದೆಯೋ ತಿಳಿಯದು. ಜೈಲಿನಲ್ಲಿರತಕ್ಕ 200 ಜನ ಬೈದಿಗಳಿಗೆ ಸ್ನಾನಮಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಲಕ್ಷಾಂತರ ರೂಪಾಯಿಗಳನ್ನು ಕೊಟ್ಟಿದ್ದೀರಿ ಎಂದು ನಮ್ಮ ಸ್ನೇಹಿತರು ಹೇಳಿದರು. ಎಷ್ಟು ನೀರನ್ನು ಉಪಯೋಗ ಮಾಡಿದ್ದಾರೆ, ಮಿಷ್ಟರ್ ರೀಡರ್ ಎಷ್ಟು ಆಗಿದೆ ಎಂಬುದನ್ನು ಅವರು ಗಮನಿಸಿದ್ದಾರೆಯೇ? ಇಲ್ಲ. ಒಂದು ಊರಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಒಂದು ಶಾರ್ ಕಟ್ಟಬೇಕು, ಆಸ್ಪತ್ರೆ ಕಟ್ಟಬೇಕು, ಕುಡಿಯುವ ನೀರಿನ ಭಾವಿಯನ್ನು ತೆಗೆಸಬೇಕು ಎಂದರೆ ನಿಮ್ಮ ಹತ್ತಿರ ಹಣ ಇಲ್ಲ. ಔಷಧಿ ಒದಗಿಸುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಹಣ ಇಲ್ಲ, ಇಂತಹ ಅಂಧಕಾರ ದೌಲತ್ತು ಎಷ್ಟು ಕಾಲ ನಡೆಯುತ್ತದೆ ಎಂದು ಕೇಳುತ್ತೇನೆ.

ದಿವ್ಯಾಂಡ್ ನಂಬರ್ 10 : ಸರ್ಕಾರದ ಮುಖೇನೆ ಒಂದು ಹೊಟೆಲು ನಡೆಯುತ್ತದೆ. ಈ ಹೊಟೆಲು ಬೇರೆ ಕಡೆ ನಡೆದಿದ್ದರೆ ಒಂದು ಕ್ಷಣ ಕಾಲ ಕೂಡ ನಡೆಯುತ್ತಾ ಇರಲಿಲ್ಲ. ಹೆಲ್ತ್ ಇನ್‌ಸ್ಟ್ರಕ್ಟರು, ಡೈರೆಕ್ಟರ್ ಆಫ್ ಪಬ್ಲಿಕ್ ಹೆಲ್ತ್, ಕಾರ್ಪೊರೇಷನ್ ಹೆಲ್ತ್ ಆಫೀಸರು, ಮುನಿಸಿಪಲ್ ಆಡ್ಮಿನಿಸ್ಟ್ರೇಷನ್ ಇನ್‌ಸ್ಟ್ರಕ್ಟರ್ ಇದೆ. ತಾವು ಸ್ವಲ್ಪ ಆ ಕಡೆ ಹೋಗಿ ಒಡಾಡಿ ಅದು ಹೇಗೆ ಇದೆ. ಅಲ್ಲ ಬರತಕ್ಕ ವಾಸನೆಯನ್ನು ತಡೆದುಕೊಳ್ಳುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಸಾಧ್ಯವೇ ಎಂಬುದನ್ನು ತಾವೇ ತಿಳಿದುಕೊಳ್ಳಬಹುದು. ಇದಕ್ಕೆ ಮುಖ್ಯ ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳು, ಸರ್ಕಾರದ ಚೀಫ್ ಸೆಕ್ರೆಟರಿಗಳು ಅವರ ಕೈಕೆಳಗೆ ಒಬ್ಬ ಡೆಪ್ಯುಟಿ ಸೆಕ್ರೆಟರಿ ಒಬ್ಬ ಅಂಡರ್ ಸೆಕ್ರೆಟರಿ, ಅವರ ಕೈಕೆಳಗೆ ನೂಪರಿಂಟೆಂಡೆಂಟರು, ಒಬ್ಬರು ತಹಸೀಲ್ದಾರರು ಹೀಗೆ ಅನೇಕ ಜನಗಳನ್ನು ಇಟ್ಟುಕೊಂಡು ಇದನ್ನು ನಡಿಸುತ್ತಾ ಇದ್ದೀರಿ, ಅಲ್ಲ ಬರತಕ್ಕ ವಾಸನೆ ಅವರು ತಯಾರು ಮಾಡತಕ್ಕ ಪದಾರ್ಥಗಳನ್ನು ತಿಂದು ಹೊಟ್ಟೆನೋವಿನಿಂದ ಮೂರು ತಿಂಗಳ ಕಾಲ ಆಸ್ವತ್ರ್ಯದಲ್ಲಿ ಇರಬೇಕಾದ ಪ್ರಸಂಗ ಬರುವುದು ಹೆಚ್ಚೇನೂ ಅಲ್ಲ. ಇದನ್ನು ತಮ್ಮ ಗಮನಕ್ಕೆ ತಂದಿದ್ದೇನೆ. ಈ ಹೋಟೆಲಿನ ವ್ಯವಹಾರ ಚೆನ್ನಾಗಿಲ್ಲ, ವ್ಯಥಾ ಖರ್ಚಾಗುತ್ತಿದೆ. ಅದುದರಿಂದ ಯಾರಾದರೂ ಬೇರೆಯವರಿಗೆ ಏಕೆ ಚೆನ್ನಾಗಿ ನಡೆಯುವಂತೆ ಮಾಡಿ, ಈ ಕ್ಯಾಂಟೀನನ್ನು ತಕ್ಷಣ ಮುಚ್ಚಿ ಇದಕ್ಕಾಗುತ್ತಿರುವ ಖರ್ಚನ್ನು ಉಳಿಸಿ.

ಒಂದು ಪ್ಲವಿಯನ್ನು ಆದಿದ್ದೇ ಆದಬೇಕಾಗಿದೆ. ಇದುವರೆಗೆ ಆಂಟಿ-ಕರಪ್‌ಷನ್ ಇರಾಬಿ ಇತ್ತು, ಈಗ ಏಜೆರೆನ್ಸ್ ಕಮಿಷನ್ ನೇಮಕವಾಗಿದೆ. ಏಜೆರೆನ್ಸ್ ಕಮಿಷನರ ನಂಬವೇನು, ಅವರಿಗೆ ಸಿಬ್ಬಂದಿ ಎಷ್ಟಿದೆ ಎಂದು ಕೇಳಿದರೆ ಮುಖ್ಯ ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳು ಉತ್ತರ ಹೇಳಲಿಲ್ಲ. ಏಜೆರೆನ್ಸ್ ಕಮಿಷನ್ನಿನ ಅವಶ್ಯಕತೆ ಏನಿದೆ ? ಕೇಂದ್ರ ಸರಕಾರ ಅದನ್ನು ನೇಮಿಸಿದ ಮಾತ್ರಕ್ಕೆ ನೀವೂ ನೇಮಕ ಮಾಡಬೇಕಾದ ಅವಶ್ಯಕತೆ ಇರಲಿಲ್ಲ. ನಮ್ಮಲ್ಲಿ ಆಂಟಿ-ಕರಪ್‌ಷನ್ ಇರಾಬಿ ಇತ್ತು. ಬೇಕಾದರೆ ಅದನ್ನು ವಜಾಮಾಡಿ ಏಜೆರೆನ್ಸ್ ಕಮಿಷನ್ ನೇಮಕಮಾಡಬೇಕಾಗಿತ್ತು. ಈ ಎರಡೂ ಇರುವುದೇಕೆ ! ಅವುಗಳ ಕರ್ತವ್ಯವೇನು ? ಆಂಟಿ-ಕರಪ್‌ಷನ್ ಇರಾಬಿ ಎನ್.ಜೆ.ಒ.ಗಳನ್ನು ಹಿಡಿಯುವುದು, ಏಜೆರೆನ್ಸ್ ಕಮಿಷನ್ ಜಿ.ಒ.ಗಳನ್ನು ಹಿಡಿಯಬೇಕು ಎಂದೇನಾದರೂ ಗೊತ್ತುಮಾಡಿದ್ದೀರಾ ? ಇದೇನೋ ನನಗೆ ಅರ್ಥವಾಗಿಲ್ಲ. ಇದು ಡೂಪ್‌ಟಿಕೇಟ್ ಆಗುತ್ತದೆ, ಈ ಕೆಲಸ ಬೇಡ. ಹಣ ಉಳಿಸಬೇಕು, ಅದಕ್ಕಾಗಿ ಶೇಕಡ 30ರಷ್ಟು ಎನ್.ಜಿ.ಒ.ಗಳನ್ನು ರಿಟ್ರಿಂಟ್ ಮಾಡುತ್ತೇವೆಂದು ಜತ್ತಿಯವರು ಹೇಳುವುದು, ಹೊಸ ಇರಾಬಿ ಸೃಷ್ಟಿ ಮಾಡುವುದು, ಇದ್ಯಾವ ನ್ಯಾಯ ? ಡೈರೆಕ್ಟರ್ ಆಫ್ ಆಂಟಿ ಕರಪ್‌ಷನ್ ತೆಗೆದರೆ ಹಣ ಉಳಿಯುತ್ತದೆ. ಯಾರೋ ಐ.ಎ.ಎಸ್ ಪಾಸು ಮಾಡಿಕೊಂಡು ಬಂದಿರುವವರಿಗೆ ಕೆಲಸ ಕೊಡಲು ಜಾಗ ಸೃಷ್ಟಿ ಮಾಡುತ್ತಿರುವಂತೆ ತೋರುತ್ತದೆ. ಹೀಗೆ ಗರುಡಗಂಟಿ ಸುತ್ತುವುದನ್ನು ಗಡುವು ಮಾಡಬೇಕು. ದೇವಸ್ಥಾನದ ಮುಂದೆ ಗರುಡಗಂಟಿ ಇರುತ್ತದೆ, ಅದನ್ನು ಸುತ್ತಿ ದೇವರನ್ನು ವರ ಕೇಳುವುದುಂಟು. ಹಾಗೆ ಈ ಎರಡನ್ನೂ ಇಟ್ಟು ಕೊಳ್ಳುವುದನ್ನು ನಾನು ಒಪ್ಪುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಇದನ್ನು ಪುನರ್ವಿಮರ್ಶೆ ಮಾಡಬೇಕು.

ಜನವರಿ ತಿಂಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಒಂದು ಸಲ ಸಪ್ಲಿಮೆಂಟರಿ ಗ್ರಾಂಟಿಗೆ ಒಪ್ಪಿಗೆ ಪಡೆದರು, ಗ್ರಾಮಾಧಿಕಾರಿಗಳಿಗೆ ಕೊಡಲು ಹಣ ಬೇಕು ಎಂದು ಪಡೆದರು, ಮತ್ತೆ ಈಗ ಕೇಳುತ್ತಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ತಮಗೆ ಗೊತ್ತಿರುವ ಹಾಗೆ ತಮ್ಮ ಜಿಲ್ಲೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಹುಟ್ಟಿ ಬೆಳೆದ ಒಂದು ಸಣ್ಣ ಬ್ಯಾಂಕು ಅಭಿವೃದ್ಧಿ ಹೊಂದಿ ನೂರಾರು ಕೋಟಿ ರೂಪಾಯಿ ವ್ಯವಹಾರವನ್ನು ಎಷ್ಟು ಮಟ್ಟಿಗೆ ಚಾಕಚಕ್ಯತೆಯಿಂದ, ಬುದ್ಧಿವಂತಿಕೆಯಿಂದ ಮಾಡುತ್ತಿದೆ ಎಂಬುದು ತಮಗೆ ಚೆನ್ನಾಗಿ ಗೊತ್ತಿದೆ. ದೇಶೋದ್ಧಾರ ಮಾಡುತ್ತೇವೆ, ಬಡತನ ನೀಗಿ ಪರ್‌ಕ್ಯಾಪಿಟಾ ಇನ್‌ಕಂ ಜಾಸ್ತಿ ಮಾಡುತ್ತೇವೆ ಎಂದು ಹೇಳಿ ಸ್ಟೇಜ್‌ಡ್ರಾಮಾ ಹಣ ಖರ್ಚುಮಾಡುವುದುಂಟೆ ? ಕುಬೇರನ ಭಂಡಾರದಮೇಲೆ ಕುಳಿತು ಲೆಕ್ಕಾಚಾರ ಹಾಕುತ್ತಿರುವುದಾಗಿ ಭಾವಿಸಿ ಮನಬಂದಹಾಗೆ ಖರ್ಚುಮಾಡಿ ಹಣ ವ್ಯರ್ಥ ಮಾಡುವುದು ದೇಶಕ್ಕೆ ಗೌರವ ತರುವ ಕೆಲಸವಲ್ಲ ಎಂದು ನೊಂದ ಮನಸ್ಸಿನಿಂದ ಹೇಳುತ್ತಿದ್ದೇನೆ. ಏಜೆರೆನ್ಸ್ ಕಮಿಷನರ್ ನೇಮಕ ಮಾಡುತ್ತಿರುವುದು ಯಾವುದೋ ಒಂದು ಪೊಲಿಟಿಕಲ್ ಇಂಟರೆಸ್ಟ್ ತೃಪ್ತಿಪಡಿಸುವುದಕ್ಕೆ, ಒಬ್ಬರಿಗೆ ಹುದ್ದೆಯನ್ನು ಕೊಡಲು ಮಾಡಿರುವ ಕೆಲಸ ಎಂಬ ಭಾವನೆ ಇದೆ. ಇದನ್ನು ಸೃಷ್ಟಿಪಡಿಸಬೇಕು. ನನಗೆ ಗೊತ್ತಿರುವ ಹಾಗೆ ಈ ರಾಜ್ಯದಲ್ಲಿ ಮುಸ್ಲಿಮರಿಗೆ ಕ್ಯಾಪಿಟಲ್‌ನಲ್ಲಿ ಮಂತ್ರಿ ಪದವಿ ಕೊಡಬೇಕೆಂದು ಕೇಂದ್ರ ಸರಕಾರದವರು ಒತ್ತಾಯ ಮಾಡಿದಾಗ ಸರಕಾರ ಏನು ಮಾಡಿತು ಎಂಬುದು. ಸರಕಾರ ಒಂದು ಎಲೆಜೆರೆನ್ಸ್ ಕಮಿಷನರ ಸ್ಥಾನ ಕಲ್ಪಿಸಿ ಅಲ್ಲಗೆ ರಿಟ್ರಿಡ್ ಹೈಕೋರ್ಟ್ ಜಡ್ಜನ್ನು ಹಾಕಲು ಏನು ಮಾಡಿದೆ. ಅವರನ್ನು ಬೇಕಾದರೆ ಖಾಯಮಾಗಿ ಹೈಕೋರ್ಟ್ ಜಡ್ಜ್ ಆಗಿ ನೇಮಿಸಬಹುದಾಗಿತ್ತು ಅದನ್ನು ಬಿಟ್ಟು.....

Mr. SPEAKER.—What is the Hon'ble Member speaking ? Up to what year is he speaking ?

Sri C. J. MUCKANNAPPA.—I am speaking of the year 1964-65, supplementary estimates, where you have provided...

Mr. SPEAKER.—What is the incidence of extension ?

Sri C. J. MUCKANNAPPA.—We have provided Rs. 5,000 to be paid till the end of March 1965. What are the circumstances which warranted the appointment of that gentleman—that is my contention.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Is he questioning the appointment, or the incumbent or the office ?

Sri C. J. MUCKANNAPPA.—I am questioning the office and questioning the appointment and questioning all aspects of the case.

Mr. SPEAKER.—I will not allow this individual being brought in under any circumstances whatsoever.

Sri C. J. MUCKANNAPPA.—Not the incumbent, Sir. I have got the greatest respect for him. He was my lawyer for some time. But what was the need for the appointment—that is my contention.

Mr. SPEAKER.—What was the need for creating that post—Hon'ble Sri S. M. Krishna was saying that there was delay...

Sri C. J. MUCKANNAPPA.—That is his opinion, Sir. This is my opinion.

Mr. SPEAKER.—What did the other Hon'ble Member Sri G. V. Gowda say ?

Sri C. J. MUCKANNAPPA.—Sir, if this House were to accept the appointment of the Vigilance Commissioner, Ministers, legislators including the Hon'ble Speaker come within the purview of the Vigilance Commissioner.

Mr. SPEAKER.—The member made a remark about the Speaker I made my position clear. If he has not understood me,.....

Sri C. J. MUCKANNAPPA.—The Speaker does not come within the purview of the Vigilance Commissioner, Sir. He is above all of us. ಅದನ್ನು ಮರೆತು ಹೋದ.

ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರು.—ಇನ್ನು ಮುಂದೆ ಹೇಳಬೇಡಿ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಸಿ. ಜಿ. ಮುಕ್ಕಣ್ಣಪ್ಪ.—ಈಗ ದೇಶದಲ್ಲಿ ಹಣವಿಲ್ಲ, ಸುಂಕ ಹಾಕಬೇಕು, ಪ್ರತ್ಯಕ್ಷವಾದ ಮತ್ತು ಪರೋಕ್ಷವಾದ ತೆರಿಗೆ ಹಾಕಬೇಕು, ಕೇಂದ್ರ ಸರ್ಕಾರದಿಂದ ಸಬ್ಸಿಡಿ, ಸಾಲ ತುಂಬಿಕು ಎಂದಿರುವುದು ನನಗೆ ಗೊತ್ತಿದೆ. ಹಾಗಿರುವಾಗ ವಿಜೇತ ಕಮಿಷನರ ಭಾರಿ ಹುದ್ದೆ ಸೃಷ್ಟಿ ಮಾಡುವುದೇಕೆ? ಅದನ್ನು ನಿಲ್ಲಿಸಿ ಅದಕ್ಕಾಗುವ ಖರ್ಚನ್ನು ಹೆಚ್ಚು ಆಹಾರ ಬೆಳೆಯಲು ಏಕೆ ವಿನಿಯೋಗಿಸಬಾರದು? ಅದರ ಅವಶ್ಯಕತೆ ತಾನೆ ಏನಿತ್ತು? 5 ಸಾವಿರ ರೂಪಾಯಿಗಳನ್ನು ಇದಕ್ಕಾಗಿ ಮಾರ್ಚ್ 31ರೊಳಗೆ ಖರ್ಚುಮಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ನನ್ನ ಒಪ್ಪಿಗೆಯಿಲ್ಲ. ಇದು ಸರಿಯಾಗಿ ಕಾಣುವುದಿಲ್ಲವಾದ್ದರಿಂದ ಸರ್ಕಾರ ಗಮನಿಸಬೇಕೆಂದು ಹೇಳುತ್ತಿದ್ದೇನೆ.

ಸರ್ಕಾರಕ್ಕೆ ಒಂದು ಮೆಷೀನರಿ ಬೇಕಾದರೆ ಅದನ್ನು ತರುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಎಷ್ಟು ಹಣ ಬೇಕು, ಬಂದರಿನಿಂದ ಅಥವಾ ರೈಲು ವೆ ಸ್ಟೇಷನ್ನಿನಿಂದ ಡೆಲವರಿ ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಳ್ಳುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಎಷ್ಟು ಖರ್ಚು ಗುತ್ತದೆ ಎಂಬುದನ್ನು ಆಕೌಂಟೆಂಟ್ ಜನರಲ್ ಹೇಳಬೇಕೇ? ಸರ್ಕಾರಕ್ಕೆ ಇದಕ್ಕೆ 240 ಲಕ್ಷ ರೂಪಾಯಿ ಬೇಕೆಂಬುದೂ ಕೂಡ ಗೊತ್ತಿಲ್ಲದಿದ್ದರೆ ವ್ಯವಹಾರ ಎಷ್ಟು ಮಟ್ಟಿಗೆ ನಡೆಯುತ್ತದೆ ಎಂದು ಯೋಚನೆ ಮಾಡಬೇಕು. 25 ಜನ ಇದ್ದೀರಿ, ಇಬ್ಬರು ಪಕ್ಕಕ್ಕೆ ಇದ್ದಾರೆ, ಲೆಜಿಸ್ಲೇಷನ್ ಇದೆ, ದೊಡ್ಡ ಸರ್ಕಾರವಿದೆ. ಇಷ್ಟೆಲ್ಲಾ ಇದ್ದರೂ ಸಹ ಇಂಥಾದ್ದಕ್ಕೆ ಇಷ್ಟು ಹಣಬೇಕು ಎಂದು ಹೇಳುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಸಾಧ್ಯವಾಗದಿದ್ದರೆ ನಿಜವಾಗಿಯೂ ನಿಮಗೆ ಸರಿಯಾದ ರೀತಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಹಣಕಾಸನ್ನು ಕಾಯುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಶಕ್ತಿಯಿಲ್ಲ ಎಂದು ಹೇಳಬೇಕಾಗುತ್ತದೆ.

ಈ ಸಲಕರಣೆಗಳನ್ನು ಯಾವ ಯಾವ ಶಾಲೆಗಳಿಗೆ ಕೊಡುತ್ತಾರೆಯೋ ಎನ್ನುವ ಭಯ ನಮಗೆ ಬಂದಿದೆ. ಇದನ್ನು ಲಂಪೆನು ಆಗಿ ಇಟ್ಟುಕೊಂಡಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಲೋಕೋಪಯೋಗಿ ಇಲಾಖೆ ಯಲ್ಲಿಯೂ ಕೀಗ್ರಾಮೇ ಲಂಪೆನು ಆಗಿ ದುಡ್ಡನ್ನು ಇಟ್ಟುಕೊಂಡು ತಮಗೆ ತೋರಿದ ಕಡೆ ಖರ್ಚು ಮಾಡುತ್ತಾರೆ. ಎಲ್ಲೆಗೆ ನ್ಯಾಯವಾಗಿ ಬೇಕು, ಎಲ್ಲೆಗೆ ನೂಕುವಿದೆ ಅಲ್ಲೆಗೆ ಕೊಡಿ. ಆ ರೀತಿ ಕೊಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಒಂದು ನೀತಿ, ತತ್ವ, ಒಂದು ನಿಯಮ ಹಾಕಿಕೊಂಡು ಕೊಡಬೇಕು ಎಂದು ಸರ್ಕಾರಕ್ಕೆ ಮುನ್ನೆಡ್ಡರಿಕೆ ಕೊಡಲು ಹೇಳುತ್ತಿದ್ದೇನೆ.

6-00 P.M.

13 ಲಕ್ಷ ರೂಪಾಯಿಗಳನ್ನು ಕ್ಷಾಮ ಪರಿಹಾರ ಕಾರಣಗಳಿಗಾಗಿ ಗುಲ್ಬರ್ಗಾ ಡಿವಿಷನ್ನಿಗೆ ಮಂಜೂರು ಮಾಡಲಾಯಿತು ಎಂದು ಹೇಳಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಈ ರಾಜ್ಯದಲ್ಲಿ ಕೋಲಾರ, ತುಮಕೂರಿನ ಕೆಲವು ಭಾಗ ಚಿತ್ರದುರ್ಗ, ಬಳ್ಳಾರಿ, ಈ ಎಲ್ಲ ಭಾಗಗಳೂ ಕೂಡ ಕ್ಷಾಮ ಡಾಮರಗಳಿಗೆ ತುತ್ತಾಗುತ್ತವೆ. ಕೀಗ್ರಾಮೇ ಗುಲ್ಬರ್ಗಾಕ್ಕೆ ಮಾತ್ರ 13 ಲಕ್ಷ ರೂಪಾಯಿ ಖರ್ಚುಮಾಡುವುದು ನ್ಯಾಯವೇ ಸ್ವಾಮಿ? ಇದೇ ರೀತಿಯಾಗಿ ನಾನು ಹೇಳಿದ ನಾಲ್ಕೈದು ಜಿಲ್ಲೆಗಳೂ ಕೂಡಬೇಕು. ಗುಲ್ಬರ್ಗಾ ಜಿಲ್ಲೆಯ ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳಿದ್ದಾರೆ ಮಂತ್ರಿಮಂಡಲದಲ್ಲಿದ್ದಾರೆ, ಏನು ಮಾಡಿದರೂ ನಡೆಯುತ್ತದೆ, ಏನು ಬೇಕಾದರೂ ಖರ್ಚು ಮಾಡಬಹುದು ಎನ್ನುವುದಾದರೆ ಹೇಗೆ? ಕೋಲಾರ, ತುಮಕೂರು, ಚಿತ್ರದುರ್ಗ, ಬಳ್ಳಾರಿ ಈ ಜಿಲ್ಲೆಗಳ ಜನರೂ ಬಹಳ ಸಂಕಟ ಪರಿಸ್ಥಿತಿಯಲ್ಲಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಅವರಿಗೂ ಪರಿಹಾರ ಕಾರ್ಯಗಳಿಗೆ ಗುಲ್ಬರ್ಗಾದ ಜನರಿಗೆ ಏನು ಸಹಾಯವನ್ನು ಕೊಟ್ಟಿದ್ದಾರೆ ಗುಲ್ಬರ್ಗಾಕ್ಕೆ ಏನು ಪರಿಹಾರವನ್ನು ಕೊಟ್ಟಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಅದೇ ರೀತಿಯಾಗಿ ಕೊಡಬೇಕು. ಈಗ ಇಲ್ಲದೆ ಹೋದರೆ 1965-66ನೇ ಆಯವ್ಯಯದಲ್ಲಿ ಅದರೂ ಅವರಿಗೆ ಸಹಾಯ ಮಾಡಲು ಹಣವನ್ನು ಒದಗಿಸ ಬೇಕೆಂದು ಹೇಳುತ್ತೇನೆ.

ನಮ್ಮ ರಾಜ್ಯದಲ್ಲಿ ಸಂಗೀತ, ಕಲೆ, ನಾಟಕ, ನೃತ್ಯ, ಇವುಗಳಿಗೆ ಹಣವನ್ನು ಕೊಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಒಂದು ಕೋಟಿ ರೂಪಾಯಿಗಳನ್ನು ಕೇಳಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಯಾರು ಕುಣಿಯುತ್ತಾರೆ, ಯಾರು ಸಂಗೀತ ಹಾಡುತ್ತಾರೆ, ಯಾರು ತಬಲ ಬಡಿಯುತ್ತಾರೆ, ಯಾರಿಗೆ ಹಂಚುತ್ತಾರೆ, ಹೇಗೆ ಹಂಚುತ್ತಾರೆ ಎನ್ನುವುದು ಇದುವರೆಗೂ ನನಗೆ ಗೊತ್ತಿಲ್ಲ. 50 ಸಾವಿರ ರೂಪಾಯಿಗಳನ್ನು ನಮ್ಮ ಮೈಸೂರು ಮಹಾರಾಜರಿಗೆ ಕೊಡಬೇಕು ಎಂದು ಹೇಳಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಮೈಸೂರು ಮಹಾರಾಜರ ವಶ ಕೊಡುವ ಹಣ ಕೆಲವು ಸಂದರ್ಭಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಖರ್ಚಾಗಲಿಕ್ಕಿಲ್ಲ, ಕೆಲವು ಸಂದರ್ಭಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಖರ್ಚಾಗುತ್ತದೆ. 16ನೇ ಫುಟದಲ್ಲಿ 12ನೇ ಐಟನ್‌ನಲ್ಲಿ ಇದರ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಒಂದು ವಿವರಣೆಯನ್ನು ಕೊಟ್ಟಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಈ ಹಣವನ್ನು ಸರ್ಕಾರವಾಗಲೀ, ಮಹಾರಾಜರಾಗಲೀ, ರಾಜ್ಯಪಾಲರಾಗಲೀ, ಯಾರೇ ಆಗಲೀ ಯಾವ ಸಂಗೀತಗಾರನಿಗೆ ಹಣವನ್ನು ಕೊಡುತ್ತಾರೆ, ಯಾವ ಕರೆಯನ್ನು ಬೆಳೆಸುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಕೊಡುತ್ತಾರೆ ಎನ್ನುವುದು ನಮಗೆ ಗೊತ್ತಿಲ್ಲ. 50 ಸಾವಿರ ರೂಪಾಯಿಗಳನ್ನು ಹೇಗೆ ಖರ್ಚು ಮಾಡಿದರು, ಸಂಗೀತ ವಿದ್ಯೆ, ಸಂಗೀತ ರತ್ನ ಎಂದು ಟೈಟಲ್ ಕೊಟ್ಟು ಹಣವನ್ನು ಖರ್ಚು ಮಾಡುತ್ತಾರೆಯೇ, ಎನ್ನುವುದನ್ನು ಕೂಡ ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರು ಹೇಳಿಲ್ಲ. Sir, why this money is given to His Highness the Maharaja of Mysore I do not understand. I am ignorant of the fact and I request the Finance Minister to explain. I am not passing any remark against this. I only feel that it may not be correct and so I want an explanation.

Sri S. NIJALINGAPPA.—Sir, it was as a result of an Agreement entered into that certain amount is placed at the disposal of His Highness. It is a discretionary Grant.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Now, the House adjourns and meets tomorrow at 1 P.M.

The House adjourned at Ten Minutes past Six of the Clock to meet again at One of the Clock on Tuesday, the 16th March 1965.
